



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,560	11/06/2006	Olle Hemmingson	1000500-000385	3806
21839 7590 03/31/2009 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, BHARAT C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3724				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,560

Applicant(s)

HEMMINGSON, OLLE

Examiner

BHARAT C. PATEL

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final Office action in response to communication received on 2/24/09. Claim 3 is cancelled. Claims 1 and 6-9 are amended. Claim 11 is newly added. Upon the Applicant's argument, the Examiner considers examining the claim 11. However, the argument is not persuasive as claim 11 introduces new and separate neutral condition without any specific definition. Therefore, claims 1-2 and 4-11 are pending and addressed below.

Claim Objections

2. The claims are objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters such as "r0, rid, rsb and ru", corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In lines 4-5, "when the chain is in a neutral position and when the chain is being driven" is confusing. This is not clear as to what neutral position is being claimed for as to anew or different neutral position than what is set forth in claim 1. It is also not clear as neutral position and the driven condition are simultaneously considered as there is no comma between two conditions per line 4 of the claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-9 and 11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carlton 5,048,389.


Re claim 1, Carlton discloses disc saw blade 60 with a saw chain 76 mounted around the circumference of a circular disk 70, the saw chain 76 is provided with driving links 78, connecting links 80 and cutting links 82, wherein the chain 76 is guided by means of the driving links 78 in at least one chain groove. It should be noted that the groove is formed by plates 66, 68, and disc 72 per Fig.4 as explained in col. 3, lines 43-46. Carlton also discloses that the chain 76 is arranged around the periphery of the disk 70, against the bottom 74 of the groove, a projecting part 78a of each driving link that projects radially inwards can make contact, in that the bottom 74 of the groove has

radial projections 86 distributed around the circumference and the driving link has a cam surface 88 on the part 78a that projects radially inwards for interaction with the respective radial projection 86, and in that the chain 76 when driven, moves from a neutral position, in which the chain is loosely mounted around the circumference of the disk 70 and the projecting part 78a of the respective driving link 78 is loosely inserted between two adjacent radial projections 86, to a working position, in which the chain is tensioned around the circumference of the disk 70 and the cam surface 88 on the respective driving link is in contact with the associated radial projection 86 per Fig. 5; wherein the length of the saw chain 76 is matched to the radius "ro" of the disk 70, so that with the saw chain 76 and the disk 70 is arranged concentrically in the neutral position, a radius "Rid" to the projecting part 78a (bottom portion) of each driving link 78 is larger than a radius Rsb to the bottom of the groove 74 and less than a radius "Ru" to each projection 86 per modified Fig. 5 shown above. It should be noted that the equivalent markings of the radii is performed to clarify the understanding of relationship amongst various radii. As 78a portion of the driving link fits into the gulley area 74 of the disc 70, it is apparent and inherent that area of the portion 78a is smaller. Hence, the Rid, distance of the bottom portion of 78a to the center of the disc 70, is greater than the Rsb, the distance of the bottom (valley) portion of the gulley 74 with respect to the center of the disc 70.

Re claim 2, Carlton discloses that the cam surface 88 on each driving link 78 is designed to press the chain 76 radially outwards against the radial projection 86 by the

cam effect, in such a way that, in a tensioned state, the chain is held onto the disk 70 as a result of its shape per Fig. 5 and per col. 4, lines 3-36.

FIG. 5



Re claim 4, Carlton discloses that the bottom 74 of the groove has a predetermined number of projections 86 distributed evenly around the circumference of the disk 70 per Fig. 5.

Re claim 5, Carlton discloses that the bottom 74 of the groove has one projection 86 for each driving link 78 per Fig. 5.

Re claim 6, Carlton discloses that radial cross-section of each projection 86 is lug shaped per Fig. 5.

Re claim 7, Carlton discloses that radial cross-section of each projection 86 is pyramid shaped per Fig. 5.

Re claim 8, Carlton discloses that radial cross-section of each projection 86 is dome shaped per Fig. 5.

Re claim 9, Carlton discloses that radial cross-section of each projection 86 is designed as a truncated cone that has a complementary shape to the cam surface 78a of the interacting driving link 78 per Fig. 5.

Re claim 11, as best understood, Carlton discloses that the construction of the chain 76 is such that the connecting links 80 are spaced radially outwardly with respect to radially outermost portions of the radial projections 86 when the chain is in a neutral position and when the chain is being driven per Fig. 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlton in view of Bueneman 2,958,348.

Re claim 10, Carlton teaches the invention as claimed as discussed above. However, Carlton fails to teach that, for a disk with several saw chains that run parallel, a corresponding chain groove is formed in the disk for each saw chain. Bueneman teaches that, for a disk with several saw chains that run parallel, a corresponding chain groove is formed in the disk for each saw chain per col. 1, lines 19-29.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide Carlton's saw blade disk with gang type structure including multiple chain grove, as taught by Bueneman, in order to provide multiple cuts simultaneously.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to provide multiple disks to form a disk as a gang of multiple disks, since it is well known in the art as to use multiple disks to produce multiple cuts in order to improve productivity, since it has also been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis paper Co. V. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/31/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In Remarks, Applicant argues that, (1) claim 11 should be examined; and, (2) Carlton does not provide an arrangement where the corresponding radius "Rid" is greater than "rsb".

In response to the Applicant's argument (1), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Upon the Applicant's argument, the Examiner considers examining the claim 11. However, the argument is not persuasive as claim 11 introduces new and separate neutral condition without any specific definition.

In response to the Applicant's argument (2), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has claimed "a radius to the projecting part of each driving link", and "a radius to the bottom of the groove" and "a radius to each each projection" which are not specific and any radius on the surfaces of the link and disk of Carlton can satisfy the claimed subject matter. The Applicant has not specifically claimed the definite radius point of a specific part. Therefore, the Examiner still considers that Carlton teaches the claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **BHARAT C. PATEL** whose telephone number is (571)270-3078. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday-Friday, alt. Friday off**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Boyer Ashley** can be reached on 24502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bharat C Patel/
Examiner, Art Unit 3724
March 20, 2009.

/Ghassem Alie/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724